DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 508 CE 030 550

AUTHOR McMillan, Samuel H., Jr.
TITLE Analysis of the Competency-Based High School Diploma Program for CETA Clients. Report III: Student/Client Completion Results.
INSTITUTION National Foundation for the Improvement of Education, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jul 80
GRANT DOL-21-11-78-25
NOTE 43p.; For related documents see CE 030 548 and CE 030 551.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Persistence; *Competency Based Education; Counselor Attitudes; Dropout Rate; Dropouts; Educational Attainment; Employment Level; Enrollment; Followup Studies; Graduate Surveys; *High School Equivalency Programs; *High School Graduates; *Outcomes of Education; Participant Characteristics; Participant Satisfaction; *Program Effectiveness; School Holding Power; Student Attitudes; *Student Attrition; Student Characteristics; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Texas

ABSTRACT

A study examined the student/client completion of a competency-based high school diploma for CETA clients. Using follow-up forms, attendance records, correspondence, telephone calls, and client information sheets, researchers collected data from clients and staff pertaining to 102 of the 238 program clients from five sites in Texas (Abilene, Brownsville, El Paso, Houston, and Temple). Despite restrictions imposed by the Privacy Act, investigators were able to obtain information concerning 76 program graduates and 26 dropouts. Thirty-seven graduates were working at some time during the 90-day follow-up period. Less than half of them felt that their jobs were directly related to their career goals. Over 90 percent of the graduates surveyed were positive about the program's impact. Follow-up of the 26 dropouts or leavers revealed that those who chose to leave generally did so because their unrealistic expectations led to quick and easy disappointment. (Related reports describing the structural and programmatic features of the pilot project as a model and the employer follow-up are available separately--see note.) (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED209508

THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION
A Non-Profit Tax Exempt Foundation Created by the NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

REPORT III

STUDENT/CLIENT COMPLETION RESULTS

Submitted to:

Employment and Training Administration
U.S. Department of Labor

Submitted by:

National Foundation for the Improvement of Education
Samuel H. McMillan, Jr.
(Author)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

July, 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Samuel H. McMillan, Jr
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ANALYSIS OF THE COMPETENCY-BASED HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA PROGRAM FOR CETA CLIENTS

This report was prepared under research and development grant No. 21-11-78-25. Since grantees conducting research and development projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgment freely, this report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Labor. The grantee is solely responsible for the contents of this report.

CE030550

1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 833-4402
Suite 302 1270 Avenue of Americas, N.Y., N.Y. 10020 (212) 581-2360

PREFACE

This report is the third in a series of six descriptive analyses that make up the final report of the Competency-Based High School Diploma (CBHSD) program for CETA clients from 1977-80. The CBHSD grew out of the Adult Performance Level (APL) Project, developed by the University of Texas, which also managed this joint pilot project for 238 students/clients in six Texas sites: Abilene, Austin, Brownsville, El Paso, Houston, and Temple. This analytical report shows the nature and effect of student/client completion results. Follow-up methodology is outlined and features both common and unique to the sites are described.

The following points are detailed: a description of the data collection process during the follow-up period, premature terminations, and student/client completions. Discussion focuses on the data sources drawn upon: initial interviews, follow-up of dropouts and completions alike, along with problems with data gathering by project administrators. The section on premature terminations distinguishes characteristics between dropouts and candidates leaving for other reasons. A review of the student/client completions includes overall statistics, length of stay for participants, a record of what program components were completed by them, employment status of graduates, plans for further education, and their judgment of CBHSD results.

The findings from the data show that some form of follow-up was made of 45% of the entire enrollment (102 candidates out of 238). Seventy-six (76) were graduates, 26 were dropouts or participants who left for other reasons. The reason why relatively little information was gathered on participants in the follow-up period is the legal restraints set on employers under the Privacy Act. It disallows employers from divulging any particulars regarding an employee's working conditions or performance on the job. Therefore, details on start-up salaries, increases in pay, promotions, and overall effectiveness at work were not available from employers.

What is known about these indicators of success on the job was provided by the graduates themselves. Thirty-two (32) of them filed their own reports. The 59 forms submitted by CETA counselors also included this kind of information. Thirty-seven (37) graduates were known to be working at some time during the 90-day follow-up period. Less than half of them thought their jobs were directly related to their career goals. Their starting salaries ran from $2.65 per hour to $6.58 per hour. One-third of them (10) received salary increases and four received promotions.

While only 26 of the graduates who responded to the follow-up answered questions about the value of the CBHSD in comparison to the regular high school, over 90% were positive about its impact. All but one of them said it differed significantly, and in a favorable

way, from regular secondary school instruction. This was mainly due to the fact that the CBHSD provided instruction in life-coping skills.

Follow-up of the 26 participants who dropped out or left for other reasons revealed that, by and large, those who chose to leave the program of their own accord did so because their unrealistic expectations led to quick and easy disappointment. For some, motivation and/or maturity were insufficient to achieve their goals. The participants who left for other reasons included a number who, though they were close to completing the coursework, had to discontinue when their projects closed down. Without financial remuneration, the candidates could not or would not complete the educational component of an HSD program. Others withdrew since they moved to other towns or found their own jobs. The remaining candidates faced family responsibilities that required their immediate and full attention.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
I.	Introduction	7
II.	Features Common to All Sites	9
	A. Follow-Up Methodology	9
	1. Overview	9
	2. Initial Interviews	9
	3. Follow-Up of Graduates	11
	4. Problems with Data Collection	11
	B. Premature Terminations	12
	1. Overall Statistics	12
	2. Characteristics	12
	C. Student/Client Completions	12
	1. Overall Statistics	12
	2. Characteristics	13
III.	Features Unique to Each Site	17
	A. Abilene	17
	1. Follow-Up Methodology	17
	2. Characteristics of Premature Terminations	17
	3. Student/Client Completions	18
	B. Austin	19
	1. Follow-Up Methodology	19
	2. Student/Client Completions	20
	C. Brownsville	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section		Page
	1. Follow-Up Methodology.....	22
	2. Premature Terminations.....	23
	3. Student/Client Completions.....	24
D.	El Paso.....	25
	1. Follow-Up Methodology.....	25
	2. Premature Terminations.....	26
	3. Student/Client Completions.....	26
E.	Houston.....	27
	1. Follow-Up Methodology.....	27
	2. Student/Client Completions.....	27
F.	Temple.....	29
	1. Follow-Up Methodology.....	29
	2. Charateristics of Premature Terminations.....	29
IV.	Appendix.....	31
A.	Follow-Up Form 1 for Graduates.....	32
B.	Follow-Up Form 2 for Graduates.....	33
C.	Follow-Up Form 3 for Graduates.....	34
D.	Follow-Up Form for CETA Counselor.....	35
E.	Monthly Attendance Record 1.....	36
F.	Monthly Attendance Record 2.....	37

LIST OF TABLES

Tables	Page(s)
Chart I	
Enrollment, Premature Terminations, Completions, and Follow-Up.....	10
Chart II	
Employment Status of Graduates.....	14-16
Chart III	
Austin Follow-Up Results.....	21

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Data Sources

Data were drawn from follow-up forms, attendance records, correspondence, telephone calls, and Client Information Sheets. Follow-up forms were designed for both graduates and local CETA office staff to submit to NFIE. There were three kinds of follow-up forms used by graduates and one form filed by the prime sponsor (see Appendixes A, B, C, and D). Attendance records included both monthly and cumulative reports from all the sites, except for Austin, which submitted only a cumulative attendance record (see Appendixes E and F for samples of both kinds of monthly report forms).

Correspondence between CETA and the APL Project Field Coordinator included letters and memos from four sites. For Brownsville, there was a memo (8/3/79) and a letter (7/16/80) regarding dropouts and graduates alike. For El Paso, there were three letters (11/20/78, 2/14/79, and 2/27/79) reporting on graduates and individuals still enrolled in the pilot project. For Houston, there was a memo (11/20/78) regarding the status of graduates. And for Temple, there was a letter (8/7/78) describing follow-up on dropouts.

There were three telephone calls between NFIE and the APL Project Field Coordinator 8/11/80, 8/19/80, and 9/8/80, all of which centered on follow-up methodology and specific inquiries about Abilene, Brownsville, and Houston projects. Client Information Sheets, based on initial and interim interviews conducted by the APL Project Field Coordinator, provided the fifth and final source for background material on student/client completions.

B. Overall Statistics

In all there were 129 follow-up forms or reports submitted by graduates and CETA staff, 55 monthly and six cumulative attendance records, six memos or letters and 87 Client Information Sheets, all of which formed the baseline data for this report. Of the follow-up forms submitted on 116 participants, 14 were invalid, since they contained incomplete information. These included one form each from Abilene, Austin, and Brownsville; two from El Paso, and nine from Houston. Therefore, the usable data included 110 forms on a total of 102 participants. (Eight individuals had two reports filed on them, which accounts for the additional number of forms.)

II. FEATURES COMMON TO ALL SITES

A. Follow-Up Methodology

1. Overview

Student/client portfolios were neither uniform nor comprehensive. There were as many as four different reports filed on candidates throughout the program: initial interviews, interim and follow-up accounts on dropouts and graduates alike submitted by CETA counselors, and follow-up forms filed by participants. The record shows how many of these reports were submitted in relation to the overall enrollment. (See Chart I on page 4.)

Of the 238 participants in the pilot project from 1977 to 1980*, 87 were interviewed. Forty of these individuals had some kind of follow-up done on them, either by CETA or by themselves when they responded to the special form mailed out. Therefore, roughly one-third of the 90 graduates (31) had portfolios containing both intake data from the initial interview and follow-up reports. Only one-tenth of the 109 dropouts (eight) had the same amount of information filed on them.

A total of 8 participants had two follow-up reports (CETA's and their own) along with interview sheets making up their portfolios, enabling NFIE a three-way view of a participant's involvement during and experience after the pilot project. Such a complete file of information exists for only 8% of the total graduate base.

In order to develop a more complete picture of premature terminations and graduates alike, NFIE drew relevant information from initial interview sheets on those candidates for whom there was no follow-up. A review of the monthly and cumulative attendance records also provided still more important clues. In addition to the 102 follow-ups conducted by project staff are tentative conclusions made by NFIE on the fate of 52 additional participants, all of whom terminated prematurely.

2. Initial Interviews

During the first few months of a participant's enrollment in the joint program, she/he was interviewed by the APL Field Coordinator, who asked if the interviewee would participate in the follow-up. A total of 75 out of the 87 agreed to do so. The remainder did not answer the question, and only one came close to saying "No" with the remark that he "guessed" he would.

---

*Based on the APL Project Field Coordinator's list of enrolled clients/students

Chart I

ENROLLMENT, TERMINATIONS, COMPLETIONS and FOLLOW UP

Site	Enrollment	Premature Terminations	Completions	Initial Interviews	Follow-up: Graduates	Follow-up: DOL and UT	Follow-up Forms and/or Reports Filed	
							by CETA	by Client
Abilene	65	35 DO* 16 OT**	7 APL 7 APL/CETA	33 22 AP#	12	-0-	12 F+	4
Austin	53	10 DO 3 OT	40 APL/CETA	11 11 AP	39	-0-	18 F	24 F
Browns-ville	39	29 DO	1 APL 9 APL/CETA	16 16 AP	10	10	20 R++	-0-
El Paso	22	10 DO 7 OT	9 APL 5 APL/CETA	5 5 AP	3	8	6 F 10 R	-0-
Houston	38	12 DO 5 OT	12 APL	13 11 AP	12	-0-	23 F	4 F
Temple	21	13 DO 8 OT	-0-	9 9 AP	-0-	8	8 R	-0-
TOTAIS:	238	148	90	87	76	26	38 R; 59 F	32 F

* Dropped out

** Left for other reasons

\# Agreed to participate in the follow-up

\+ Follow-up form submitted

++ Report with short follow-up supplied

Among the surveyed candidates there were 35 who later graduated, eight who dropped out and one who left for "other reasons."* Thirty-one graduates did participate in the follow-up. CETA reported on eight of the interviewed dropouts and one individual who left for other reasons.

3. Follow-Up of Graduates

The APL Project Field Coordinator mailed out forms, not only to the local CETA office, but also to the participants who completed one or both components of the joint program. The returns show that 59 forms (containing questions on clients at 30, 60, and 90 day intervals) were turned in by four sites. For the remaining candidates, the APL Project person made calls to two CETA staffs, who in turn called the last known employer a client worked for. This resulted in the preparation of three narrative reports on 38 more participants.

The Coordinator also mailed forms to graduates in the different sites and received responses from 32 graduates, or approximately 30% of the graduate base. To reach the rest of the participants, she made calls to relatives of the students/clients when she was in the various cities on site visits. She also made it a practice to attend all the graduations at pilot sites, which resulted once in the fortunate chance meeting with two candidates receiving their diplomas. Their whereabouts were unknown until that moment as each had left and reentered the program after the project closed.

4. Problems with Data Collection

The data both on successful completions and on premature departures amounted to roughly 45% of the total (or 102 out of 238). The reason why relatively little information was gathered on dropouts in general and graduates in particular is the legal restraints set on employers under the Privacy Act.

The Privacy Act, which was passed by Congress in 1974 in order to protect employees from any inquiries regarding their activities on the job, also prohibited project staff from asking for the kind of information necessary for a complete follow-up. The only intelligence an employer could divulge was whether a particular individual currently or recently worked at his/her establishment.

Details regarding salary, promotions, conduct, whereabouts (i.e., telephone number, address) were the strict province of an employer. A fuller discussion of the Privacy Act is taken up in Report IV; Employer Follow-Up. Because employers were bound by law not to

---

*"Other reasons" were those expressly stated by individuals as they left (e.g., moving out of town, finding a job), as opposed to what was meant by "dropout" (anyone whose departure was unexplained).

supply information about graduates, the chief source of data on salaries, promotions, job satisfaction, etc. was the graduate. Ideally, it would have suited the research design of this study to have had the details on employment from both employer and employee: in the same way that the two kinds of Client Information Sheets provided not only the viewpoint of the candidate on a number of key questions, but that of the interviewer as well.

In addressing the problem of insufficient documentation on withdrawals and completions, NFIE made a review of the Client Information Sheets. These papers often contained clues as to why candidates dropped out or left prematurely for other reasons. In five instances, these intake forms also included follow-up information, perhaps because these candidates were being interviewed at about the time they made their exit from the program.

The attendance records, both monthly and cumulative, revealed still more helpful follow-up data. For example, the cumulative records showed that 15 candidates were forced to "retire" from the programs they were enrolled in because projects closed down (El Paso, Temple).

B. Premature Terminations

1. Overall Statistics

Of the 148 premature terminations, 109 dropped out and 39 left for other reasons. By and large those who chose to leave the program of their own accord did so because their unrealistic expectations led to quick and easy disappointment, or their motivation and/or maturity were insufficient to achieve their goals. The total number of early dropouts (those leaving within the first three months) was 33, or roughly one-third of the overall dropout rate.

2. Characteristics

Of the 39 participants who left for other reasons, nearly half (14) departed within the first three months after enrolling. Half that number (7) left the Abilene project within that short period. While no reasons are given for most of these individuals' withdrawals, many of those who were interviewed expected to move to other towns in the not too distant future or faced some family responsibility that required their full and immediate attention. Then too, there were the 15 who had to leave when their projects closed down.

C. Student/Client Completions

1. Overall Statistics

Of the 76 graduates surveyed in the follow-up period, 29 had completed only one of the two components of the joint program.

This helps to explain why a large number of graduates completed their course or training in a relatively short period of time. The overall record shows that of the five sites that produced graduates, 14 had completed their work within three months.

More often than not, clients/students paralleled the experience of the Austin groups, which took from six to seven months to complete both CBHSD and CETA requirements. Only two students/clients completed both program components in two months' time. At the other extreme, 12 candidates (or 13% of the total graduate base) took from seven months to a little over a year to complete the program. A couple of them dropped out midway to tend to a family crisis and reentered later to complete requirements and take their degree.

2. Characteristics

Thirty-seven graduates were known to be working at some time during their 90 day follow-up period. Less than half thought their jobs were directly related to their career goals. This, coincidentally, approximates the same kind of record for matching job to clients' career aspirations during the CETA component of the joint program. (See Chart II on pages 14-16 for a breakdown on jobs by site.)

While only a few (26) out of the total number surveyed answered questions about the value of the CBHSD in comparison to the regular high school, over 90% were positive about its impact. All but one indicated it differed markedly from the regular secondary school, in that it taught the students life-coping skills that affected their present and future lives. Only one of the four, who stated the CBHSD made no difference and/or could not be readily distinguished from the regular high school, gave an explanation. This individual said the high school diploma was not necessary to do the kind of job he got after graduation (working as a sheet rocker).

Chart II

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF GRADUATES

Site	Type of Job	Starting Salary	Salary Increase	Promotion	Job Related to Goals	Satisfied with Job
Abilene	?(company-Texas Aero Space)	$2.85/hr			Yes (Y)	
	secretary	$3.10/hr	none			Y
	secretary	$3.10/hr	$3.50/hr			Y
	cosmetologist(owner/operator)	dependent on number of customers	four regular clients			Y
Austin	PBX operator	$2.90/hr	$3.00/hr			
	personnel clerk	$2.90/hr	$3.10/hr		Y	
	general office help	$2.90/hr			Y	
	bank employee	$3.00/hr	$3.95/hr	Y	Y	
	kitchen helper	$3.05/hr			No (N)	
	broiler(food establishment)	$3.10/hr		N		N
	receptionist/clerk	$3.10/hr		N		Y
	clerk	$3.10/hr		N		Y
	cook/production worker	$3.10/hr		N		Y
	trim carpenter	$3.10/hr		N		Y

Chart II

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF GRADUATES (continued)

Site	Type of Job	Starting Salary	Salary Increase	Promotion	Job Related to Goals	Satisfied With Job
Austin (con't)	nurse's aide	$3.20/ hr		Y		
	warehouse clerk	$3.25/ hr		N		Y
	receptionist	$3.25/ hr	$3.75/ hr			
	review technician	$3.50/ hr	$3.85/ hr			
	driver	$3.8[illegible]/ hr	none			Y
	data transcriber	$3.91/ hr		N		Y
	copy artist	$4.00/ hr	$4.50/ hr		N	
	bank teller	$4.00/ hr		Y		Y
	electrician's trainee	$4.25/ hr				
	sheet rocker	$4.50/ hr	$4.50/ hr + %-age			Y
	clerk	$5.80/ hr		Y		Y
	plumber's helper	$6.00/ hr			Y	
	carpenter	$6.58/ hr	$7.12/ hr			Y
	teacher aide	$240/ bi-monthly			Y	

Chart II

EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF GRADUATES (concluded)

Site	Type of Job	Starting Salary	Salary Increase	Promotion	Job Related to Goals	Satisfied With Job
Austin (con't)	mail clerk	$550/ mo				Y
	transport luggage (airport)	$700/ mo	none			
Brownsville	? (company: Levi Strauss)					
	? (company: Planned Parenthood)					
El Paso	bookkeeper	$2.65/ hr			Y	
	?(company: Washev Plastics)	$2.65/ hr	$2.90/ hr		Y	
	garment inspector	$3.10/ hr			N	
Houston	dental technician	$2.65/ hr			Y	Y
	courier	$550/ mo			N	N
Temple	NO GRADUATES					

TOTALS: Number graduates working.....37

Starting salary:

under $3.00/hr.....	8	under $500/mo.....	1
$3.00/hr-$4.00/hr.....	15	over $500/mo.....	2
$4.00/hr+ - $5.00/hr.....	4		
over $5.00/hr.....	3		
Number of salary increases...	10	Graduates who liked jobs...	17
Number of promotions.....	4	Jobs related to goals.....	9

III. FEATURES UNIQUE TO EACH SITE

A. Abilene

1. Follow-Up Methodology

a. Initial interviews

There were 33 candidates from Abilene who were interviewed, 22 of whom said they would participate in the follow-up. Ten of the 22 later dropped out, five left for other reasons, and seven graduated.

b. Post-graduate follow-up

A total of 14 forms were filed on 12 participants. (On two occasions, a report was submitted both by the graduate and by CETA.) Four reports were completed by the graduates, ten by CETA. The survey covered 86% of the graduate base (12 out of 14).

c. Problems in data collection

There is a fairly complete record for only five graduates (i.e., initial interview and a follow-up). The APL Field Coordinator had a chance meeting with two of these graduates when she discovered them at graduation exercises over a year after they had initially enrolled in the joint program. She requested and received their follow-up reports.

2. Premature Terminations

a. Overall statistics

There were 51 clients/students who left the Abilene project prematurely. They represent 79% of the total enrollment. Of the 35 who dropped out, 14 exited within the first three months. Sixteen persons left for other reasons.

b. Characteristics of dropouts

The documentation on 27 of the 35 dropouts came from the initial interviews, as there was no practice of making follow-ups on premature terminations. However, five "follow-ups" of a sort were found in these Client Information forms, more than likely because the candidates were at the point of dropping out when the interview was to take place.

Three had completed the CETA training. One of them was known to have quit his job after the training, and another was reported to have left town to take up work he had found on his own. The others manifested personality problems (from insecurity to overconfidence).

Seven of the remaining 22 favorably impressed the Field Coordinator ("clear on goals," "determined to succeed," etc.). As many as four of them, however, dropped out within three months of their entry into the program. One particularly striking case was a female candidate who was quite enthusiastic about working toward the HSD, and also enjoyed the strong support of her family. Yet, this individual dropped out after a month. Still another puzzling instance was a candidate who stayed six months, having impressed the interviewer as well as her instructors with her drive and ability. Everyone had "great faith in her" and believed she would return (from some undisclosed activity). She never did.

Fourteen dropouts were described as having personality problems and/or family complications. One additional person suffered from a physical injury. As in most sites, program participants such as these dropouts faced not just one, but a combination of disabling traits or tendencies. Weakness of personality, family problems, poor educational background, and economic deprivation often combined to create circumstances that overtook a candidate's desire or attempts to make this "second chance" succeed.

3. Student/Client Completions

a. Overall statistics

At the time the various follow-ups were being done, only seven of the 12 surveyed had completed both the CETA and CBHSD components. The remaining seven had finished just the APL classroom work and were enrolled in CETA manpower training programs. The length of time graduates spent in the program was from two months to a year. One graduated after two months, four after three months, three after four to six months, and four after seven months to one year.

Of the five participants who graduated from the joint program, just one had two kinds of reports filed on her; one sent by CETA, the other by her. CETA attempted to follow up on two more, but was successful in reporting on only one after 60 days, when that individual terminated her employment in order to marry and leave the area. CETA also lost contact with the other, who had just completed the CBHSD component. She had a critically ill child who required special treatment out of town. While she was reported to have reenrolled in the program, where she finally completed her CETA training, no other follow-up on her was done.

b. Employment status

One of the five graduates rented some space in a building in order to build up a clientele for a beauty shop. After 90 days, she was servicing four regular customers, and said that her salary was

dependent on the number of customers she had. In the form she filed, she described the CBHSD program as something that should be continued.

Two more were working as secretaries, one of whom had just won a salary increase (from $3.10/hour to $3.50/hour). They liked their jobs and said the CBHSD had not only helped them to get their jobs, but also made them feel "more confident" in doing their work. All told, four of the five graduates were known to have found a job, with only one reporting an increase in salary. Three of them liked their jobs, two of them directly related to the career goals of the graduates.

The seven who had completed only the CBHSD included:

- one for whom two reports were filed (CETA's and the client's)
- two for whom CETA reports were submitted
- four for whom there was one report each from CETA

Four were enrolled in manpower training courses (secretarial, clerical) at the time of the follow-up, and were therefore receiving the CETA allowance of $2.90 per hour. One left to have a baby although she intended to return to enroll in LVN schooling courses. Another left for Kansas. Before doing so, she said her future plans were to further her education by attending a business school. She felt that thus far the HSD had not "helped very much." Yet she described it as a "wonderful program" as it enabled "so many of us who did not finish our education" to succeed. She added that "The people who worked with us were so very helpful and understanding." This person and all the others surveyed (making a total of six) were involved in CETA training that was directly related to their career goals.

B. Austin

1. Follow-Up Methodology

a. Initial interviews

Eleven of the 16 candidates in the first group (December 1978 - June 1979) were interviewed. All of them said they would participate in the follow-up and they, plus five more, did do so. No initial interviews were conducted with the second group (March 1979 - October 1979). But of the 25 who graduated, only one was not surveyed. In all, 39 graduates were reported on or filed their own accounts.

The length of time required to complete the program included six months for the first group of 15, and seven months for the second group of 25. Since there were no monthly reports it was not possible to determine what individual variations there were among candidates.

b. Premature terminations

No follow-ups were done on dropouts or those who left for other reasons (comprising altogether 13 individuals). Since there were no interviews conducted among candidates who later left the program without completing it and no monthly records of attendance, explanations regarding the circumstances surrounding their departures cannot be offered. What one does know, from examining the cumulative attendance record from the second group, is that three candidates dropped out after one month, three more after two months, and one at the end of the third month, making a total of seven early dropouts. It is not known when the only dropout from the first program terminated. Among those who dropped out for other reasons, one left after two months and two after four months.

2. Student/Client Completions

a. Overall statistics

Of the 39 graduates surveyed, 24 filed their own reports and 15 were followed up by the CETA office. Two from the second group not only submitted their own report but were also followed up by the CETA office. Because two different forms were used, each of them asking for dissimilar kinds of information, it is not possible to give a complete profile of each student. In addition, numerous questions were left unanswered on both client and CETA forms, which accounts for considerable fluctuation in the tallies given on responses to particular questions. (See Chart III on page 21.)

b. Employment status

The results show that among the graduates, 26 were working and 13 were not at the time follow-up was being done. Six were actively looking for work. Among the 14 who answered the question, "Do you like your job?", all but one said yes. The same number received promotions (5) as did not. Nine received salary increases (representing gains of 10¢ to $1.75 per hour).

Of the 25 who listed their salaries, there are these figures. The lowest starting salary was $2.65 per hour, the highest $6.58 per hour. About half (11) started at salaries in the neighborhood of $2.40 per hour to $3.10 per hour. Only two had hourly wages starting as high as $5.80 per hour or more.

Chart III

AUSTIN FOLLOW-UP RESULTS

Inquiry	Group I: 15 Respondents	Group II: 24 Respondents	Totals
Working	10 Yes (Y) 5 No (N)	16 Y 8 N	26 Y 13 N
30/60/90 day follow-up	30 60 90 4 3 4 Two of the four had interrupted employment.	30 60 90 1 1 4 Four were working; one entered community college.	30/60/90 5 4 8 working: 8 school: 1
Looking for work	-0-Y -0-N	6 Y -0-N	6 Y 0 N
Job satisfaction	5 Y -0-N	8 Y 1 N	13 Y 1 N
Promotion	-0-Y -0-N	5 Y 5 N	5 Y 5 N
Salary increase	5 Y 2 N	4 Y 1 N	9 Y 3 N
Further education	2 Y 6 N	4 Y 4 N	6 Y 10 N
CBHSD is different from regular high school in a positive way	6 Y 2 N	9 Y 2 N	15 Y 4 N

All but one of the seven answered "Yes" to the question, "Is your job related to your goal?" Six had plans for further education; ten did not. Fifteen said the CBHSD was different from the regular high school; four disagreed. The differences cited by the overwhelming majority of respondents include:

the CBHSD teaches	•	life-coping skills	7 (number graduates)
develops	•	employable skills	3
	•	self-confidence, a general understanding, positive outlook	3
provides	•	an alternative style of learning (less memorization, fewer tests, more writing and activities)	3

In describing the ways in which the HSD was helping the graduates, they pointed out that it provided:

•	greater opportunity to secure a job	3
•	entry into technical schools and/or community colleges	1
•	practical skills for day-to-day living	1

While few answered the above question, many more articulated their reasons for pursuing an HSD through the joint program. Eleven hoped the diploma would lead to a "good job" more quickly. Eight wanted to develop and project a good self-image. Five wanted to enter technical school or college.

Future plans for the respondents included job-related activities or family matters and schooling. Six said they were planning on preparing for or entering into the following fields: computer technology, counseling, printing business, day care, and general office work. Four were making plans to marry, raise a family, or take better care of their children, both financially and educationally. One expected to pursue further education.

C. Brownsville

1. Follow-Up Methodology

a. Overview

There were problems associated with the collection of follow-up data on graduates. The first assessor in the project stated he would not participate because the process was "too involved." As a result, no official forms were filed by graduates or CETA staff, which would have given details regarding salary, promotions, job satisfaction, and the graduates' view of the CBHSD, along with their goals, future plans, thoughts about further education, etc. The documentation which was submitted on graduates only listed where an individual worked or studied (including whether he/she was on scholarship).

The second assessor was approached by the APL Project Field Coordinator to give more follow-up data on student/client completions. While promising to carry out a more extensive follow-up on the 10 Brownsville graduates, he still had not delivered any reports as of mid-July, 1980.

Efforts were made to follow-up dropouts as well. The reason which prompted project staff to do this was to help determine why there was so large a turnover in the student/client population. During the period from April 1978 through March 1979, there were anywhere from four to 10 candidates dropping out each month, but no graduates. What is known about these dropouts is gleaned from the brief paragraphs written by CETA on the participants and the appraisals given by the APL staff person in her interview forms. In all, there is some kind of documentation on 18 premature terminations, eight of them drawn from the original interview and ten from the follow-up. Two dropouts had received an initial appraisal by the Field Coordinator as well as by the CETA staff. No clients/students were cited for having left for "other reasons."

b. Initial interviews

Of the 16 candidates who were interviewed, all agreed to participate in the follow-up. Twelve later dropped out and four graduated. While only two of these dropouts were followed up, all but one of the graduates were reported on in the follow-up.

2. Premature Terminations

As many as ten candidates left in the early stages of the program (i.e., within the first three months). The probable reasons for these early departures and for the large dropout rate in general appear to stem from personal limitations and family problems of those surveyed. Among six of the candidates, there were these intervening factors which interfered with their learning:

- personality problems (unrealistic or uncertain goals, poor discipline, lack of motivation) — 4 (number of people)
- family responsibilities — 1
- poor educational background (lack of English language skills) — 1

A couple of the 10 candidates did come across as promising individuals to the interviewer, however. They both seemed so determined to earn the HSD. The one who encountered strong family opposition to her program participation dropped out after three months.

The two dropouts for whom there are both an initial appraisal and a follow-up present reveal studies in failed ambitions. One was brought on by the client herself; the other, by the joint staff's apparent inability to address the client's problem.

In the former instance, the candidate struck the interviewer as one who projected an image of competence and ability, neither of which was warranted by her APL test score. Nevertheless, she was working hard at a job she not only liked but which also fit in with her plan of becoming a physical education teacher (i.e., recreation aide in a city park). These more positive indicators for future success led the interviewer to conclude the client would complete the program. However, she was terminated after five months for reasons of "insubordination." This reason for dismissal tended to bear out the interviewer's initial reservations regarding the individual.

In the second case, a male candidate was assigned to janitorial work as his CETA job experience, an activity he disliked and also felt was totally unrelated to his goal of becoming an auto mechanic. This unfortunate mismatching of job with career aspiration concerned the interviewer enough that she brought the matter up with the CETA director, who in turn said reassignment was out of the question. The client appeared to have a strong interest in completing the course, stating he placed a high value on the HSD. But, after three months, he, too, left the program, having found a job with a construction company.

3. Student/Client Completions

a. Overall statistics

Brownsville graduates present an interesting record in terms of the length of time they required to complete their individual programs. They run the gamut from having candidates who marked the earliest successful completion of both components, as well as the record for the longest time taken in fulfilling the requirements (anywhere from 7 months to over a year).

After Brownsville had not been producing any graduates for more than 10 months, there was, in early 1979, a rush of candidates not only earning the CBHSD, but at a rapid rate. Just before January 1979, a community person took an interest in the progress of the participants in the CETA/CBHSD program. By working through the Director of the Adult Basic Education Coop Center, he provided scholarship aid to any candidates interested in pursuing further education at Texas Southernmost College (TSC), as long as they completed all CBHSD requirements. As many as four of the 10 individuals who did so responded to this challenge and received scholarships to TSC. One of them completed all course work in the shortest period of time recorded for candidates in the six sites (two months). Another finished within three months. The other two, who had entered the pilot project many months prior to the scholarship offer, drew their programs to a successful close within weeks once the financial assistance to college was provided.

4. Employment Status

Of the ten who graduated, two were working at the time of the follow-up. Five were in school, four of them on scholarships. One entered the Marine Corps. Two went back to being housewives. Because no follow-up was conducted beyond determining the whereabouts of the graduates, there is no way of knowing what these individuals felt about the CBHSD, their future plans and goals, or details surrounding their employment and schooling.

D. El Paso

1. Follow-Up Methodology

a. Overview

The follow-up was done on 11 participants:

- three finished both CETA and CBHSD components
- three had completed the CETA training
- one had done the APL course
- four were participating (focused on doing the CETA training)

This then means that there were final follow-up reports on three of the five candidates who had fulfilled all program requirements, and interim reports on eight others, who had done only one of the two components. The follow-ups included both the official forms (filed by CETA) and short paragraph descriptions of candidates.

Initial interviews, follow-ups and cumulative attendance records give some clues as to why as many as 16 individuals left before completing both the CETA and CBHSD sections of the joint program. Information on eight of them came from follow-up forms, the remaining from the initial interviews.

b. Initial interviews

There were five clients/students interviewed, all of whom said they were willing to participate in the follow-up. Every one terminated from the program prematurely; four dropped out, one left for other reasons.

2. Premature Terminations

a. Characteristics of dropouts

Of the five dropouts who were interviewed, three left within three months of entering the program. The interviewer had felt that two of them evidenced strong interest in the program. In addition, one of the two had a good previous work record and was encouraged by her husband to complete the diploma program. The other had progressed far enough to be near completion. Only the third failed to impress the interviewer, even though she asserted that she would continue in the project after the CETA allowance discontinued (which, according to the attendance record, she did not do).

b. Characteristics of those who left for other reasons

The two who had clear goals and strong motivation to pursue the HSD were precluded from doing so because their project closed down. Not only were these two prevented from finishing the course, but a review of the cumulative attendance record shows that five others were also kept from completing the program for the same reason.

Of the seven who left because the project closed, three had at least completed the CETA training; three had not. Because the participants realized they would have insufficient time to complete all requirements, they decided to forego the APL program (for which they would not be paid to continue) and turned instead toward pursuing the GED.

3. Student/Client Completions

Two of the five graduates completed their program after three months, two after four months, and one after five months. All three graduates surveyed were working at the time of the 30 day follow-up. Two were working on the 60th day and one after 90 days. Two started at a salary of $2.65 per hour, one at $3.10 per hour. One increased her salary by 25¢ per hour. Two had jobs related to their goals.

The one whose job was unrelated to her career ambitions sought further training in order to improve her typing skills. She was displeased with her work as a garment inspector, although the job paid more than what she would receive as an entry-level secretary.

E. Houston (Harris County)

1. Follow-Up Methodology

a. Overview

The Houston project faced extraordinary logistical problems in the process of conducting the follow-up. Houston is a great urban sprawl, a physical factor that dominated the entire planning and operation of the pilot project. It resulted, for example, in the decision to offer the APL study before the CETA training (rather than providing both simultaneously, as was the case in all the other sites). This separation of CBHSD coursework from CETA training was done in recognition of the fact that the buildings for each activity were so many miles distant from each other and from the students/clients.

The same logistical problems led to the decision by the CETA staff to exclude from the follow-up:

- any graduates that found jobs on their own
- candidates who had a "nonpositive termination"
- individuals who left for "other reasons"

There were seven candidates who answered to the description of the first two categories. Another 14 dropped out or left for other reasons and were not surveyed as a result.

b. Initial interviews

Eleven of the 13 candidates interviewed agreed to participate in the follow-up. All of them had completed the CBHSD component of the joint program. A total of 12 participated in the follow-up, representing a gain of one over the original number expressing an interest in doing so. Among those surveyed, four had also submitted follow-up forms and were reported on by CETA as well.

2. Student/Client Completions

Three participants completed after one month, three after two months and nine within three months. Six finished after four to six months. Because none of the 12 had completed their vocational training at the time of the follow-up, there were no 30/60/90 day reports conducted on them. Three were described as "holding" (i.e., in limbo).

The record shows that 10 were seeking further education (including the two "in the program holding"). They were enrolled in the following training programs;

• Houston Skill Center	3	(number enrolled)
• Massey Business College	2	
• Goodwill (general office skills training)	2	
• Texas Dental Technology School	1	
• American Institute of Technology	1	
• Houston Community College	1	

The third candidate "in holding" was not seeking further education and was terminated from CETA two months after she completed the CBHSD.

Among the four who had as many as three different reports of their progress on file, there is this breakdown of their status vis-a-vis employment. Two stated they were simultaneously working and in school. One was making $2.65 per hour as a trainee in a special dental lab technician's program. She liked the job, which was directly related to her goal of becoming a dental assistant.

Without the high school diploma, she did not think she could have gotten into this school, and went on to comment that the APL taught her "a lot of things I didn't know concerning government and economics." The interviewer seemed to think this individual would succeed, describing her as a "sharp person, (who) seems very determined to get what she wants."

The other person, who was studying at the American Institute of Technology, was also working as a courier, but disliked it since she didn't like driving in the Houston traffic." She was making $550 per month and planned eventually to enter the Navy, where she could pursue training in electronics. The value of the HSD for her was that it gave her "more self-confidence." While the interviewer thought this participant's aspirations were commendable, she expressed some doubts as to whether the client could gain entry into the Navy, let alone break into so difficult a field as electronics and then "stick it out."

The remaining two candidates were not working, but stated that their HSD was essential to their entry into the colleges and training programs where they were at the time of the follow-up. One said she would recommend it "to anyone who wanted to improve their way of earning money or to prepare themselves for a better way of life," and added, "The APL program also gives a person more pride in one's own accomplishments."

The interviewer noted at the outset of her conversation with this woman that the client worried over whether she was "too old" to succeed. Because of the client's demonstrated ability at working with figures and desire to work as a bookkeeper, the interviewer felt the woman would probably succeed, if, she noted, the woman could face the inevitable ups and downs of a competitive market.

The other individual, who was enrolled as a trainee in a day care program, described the APL program as "ideal for adults who were not able to finish high school earlier." The Field Coordinator felt this candidate would more than likely complete her plans. Working in or around patients was right in this candidate's line, as she was "a very fine person, friendly, soft-spoken, and eager to better herself."

F. Temple

1. Follow-Up Methodology

Of the nine candidates interviewed, all indicated they would participate in the follow-up. None graduated and no one took part in any follow-up reports. However, CETA followed up eight other Temple participants, all of them premature terminations as well.

2. Characteristics of Premature Terminations

While none of the interviewed candidates were followed up, there are some clues suggested in the Client Information Sheets that shed some light on the circumstances surrounding their departures. The cumulative attendance record also points to the reasons some left.

Three candidates came across to the interviewer as individuals with considerable personal problems. One lacked the drive to move on with her life. She had lived on welfare and accepted the "inevitability" of falling back on it "if all else failed." Another, who had already passed two parts of the GED before entering the pilot project, was leaning toward the idea of dropping the CBHSD/CETA course in favor of completing the GED. She was "disgusted" to find all the additional "material, work, etc." involved in fulfilling all the requirements for the joint program and further disliked paying $1 a day for transportation to attend APL classes.

The third individual was pregnant but thought she could still devote sufficient energies toward completing the diploma program. In addition to her somewhat unrealistic ambitions, she exhibited a speech defect, and appeared to the interviewer to be a slow learner as well.

Yet, the majority of the interviewed candidates (5) impressed the APL Project person with a number of positive attributes. Two had insisted on the importance of earning a diploma, in order to get a job

and therefore never again go back on welfare. Another "sharp" individual who "knows the ropes" had assumed financial support for his family, which years earlier had led to his premature withdrawal from high school. Others were described as "mature," "clear thinking," and "doing well in the program."

Because the project closed down after six months, it precluded four of these five individuals from completing their individual programs. The reasons for the fifth individual's departure (one month before the other four) are open to conjecture, as nothing is documented concerning the circumstances surrounding his withdrawal. This was the individual described by the APL Project person as one who had real coping skills. More than likely, when he saw the project closing down, he found a job in order to support his family, leaving aside any thought of completing a high school diploma.

The La Vega Adult Basic Education Center sent invitational letters and followed up with calls to the 10 students still enrolled in the Temple program just before the project closed down. None of them, including the five who had appeared so committed to receiving an HSD, accepted the invitation. One can only assume that the money the students received for attending the APL classes was necessary for their continuation, and once that was gone, there was no particular incentive to complete the course at the La Vega ABE center.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Follow-Up Form 1 for Graduates

DATE_____

NAME_____ SOCIAL SECURITY #_____

ADDRESS_____ TELEPHONE #_____

_____

Please complete the questions listed below which apply to you and your present situation.

Are you working? Yes___ No___ If yes, where? _____

If no, what seems to be the problem? _____

_____

Are you actively looking for work? _____

Are you enrolled in school? Yes___ No___

If yes, where? _____

What is your goal? _____

_____

When do you expect to complete your schooling? _____

If you are not working or attending school, what are your future plans?

_____

Do you continue to feel having your high school diploma has helped you?

Yes___ No___ If yes, in what way? _____

_____

Thank you for completing this form and returning it to this office in the self-addressed, stamped envelope. I will contact you again in the near future.

Sincerely,

Ann Brownlow
APL Project Field Coordinator

APPENDIX B

Follow-Up Form 2 for Graduates

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

NAME_____ DATE_____

ADDRESS_____ SOCIAL SECURITY #_____

_____ TELEPHONE #_____

Please complete the following questions which apply to you and your situation.

Are you still working for the same company? ___Yes ___No

If not, where are you working? _____

Date started: _____

Why did you change jobs? _____

_____

Within the past three months, have you received:

a job promotion? ___Yes ___No

a salary increase? ___Yes ___No

Are you still enrolled in school? ___Yes ___No

If not, why? _____

_____

Remarks: _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX C

Follow-Up Form 3 for Graduates

CETA/CBHSD FOLLOW-UP

NAME:_____ DATE:_____

ADDRESS:_____ SOCIAL SECURITY #:_____

_____ TELEPHONE #:_____

Please complete the questions listed below which apply to you and your present situation.

Are you enrolled in school? ___Yes ___No

If yes, where? _____

What is your goal? _____

When did you enroll? _____

When do you expect to complete your schooling? _____

* *

Are you working? ___Yes ___No

If yes, where? _____

Date you were employed: _____ Position: _____

Starting salary: _____ Have you had any promotions? ___Yes ___No

Do you like your job? ___Yes ___No

If no, why? _____

_____

* *

If you are not working or attending school, what are your future plans?

_____

_____

Are you looking for work? ___Yes ___No

* *

Why did you want a high school diploma? _____

_____

How do you feel about the Competency-based High School Diploma Program?

_____

At what grade in school did you drop out? _____

Does the CBHSD material differ from regular high school work? ___Yes ___No

If yes, in what way is it different? _____

_____

Thank you so much for completing this form. I congratulate you on completing the CBHSD Program.

APPENDIX D

Follow-Up Form for CETA Counselor

Follow-Up on CETA/CBHSD Completions

1. _____
Participant's name

2. _____
Social Security Number

3. _____
Address

_____
City State Zip

4. _____
Date Completed CETA/CBHSD

5. _____
Where Employed

6. Further Education __ Yes __ No
(If yes, where?)

_____

7. _____
Address of Employment

8. _____
Beginning Salary

_____
Present Salary

9. _____
Supervisor's Address

10. Is this employment/education related to goal of the participant? __yes __no
(If no, please explain why it is not.) _____

_____

_____

11. CETA's 30-day follow-up _____

_____

12. CETA's 60-day follow-up _____

_____

13. CETA's 90-day follow-up _____

_____

14. Remarks: _____

_____

15. _____
CETA Counselor

APPENDIX E

Monthly Attendance Record (1)

AIL TO:

he University of Texas at Austin
dult Performance Level Project
ducation Annex S-21
ustin, Texas 78712

Training Facility _____ Date of Report _____

NAME OF STUDENT	SOC. SEC. #	APL LEVEL	DATE ENROLLED	SCHEDULED FOR:		DATE TERMINATED		
				HRS. PER DAY	DAYS PER WK.	COMPLETED	DROPPED OUT	OTHER

SIGNATURE

TYPE: NAME & TITLE PHONE NO.

36

38

39

APPENDIX E

Monthly Attendance Record (1)

AIL TO:

he University of Texas at Austin
dult Performance Level Project
ducation Annex S-21
ustin, Texas 78712

Training Facility

Date of Report

NAME OF STUDENT	SOC. SEC. #	APL LEVEL	DATE ENROLLED	SCHEDULED FOR:		DATE TERMINATED		
				HRS. PER DAY	DAYS PER WK.	COMPLETED	DROPPED OUT	OTHER

SIGNATURE

TYPE: NAME & TITLE PHONE NO.

APPENDIX F

Monthly Attendance Record (2)

C.E.T.A./CBHSD MONTHLY REPORT

MAIL TO:

The University of Texas at Austin
Adult Performance Level Project
Education Annex S-21
Austin, Texas 78712

Prime Sponsor _____ Date of Report _____ County(s) Served _____

NAME OF STUDENT	SOC. SEC. #	BIRTH-DATE	SEX	RACE	DATE REFERRED	LAST CAL. YR. ATTENDED SCH.	LAST GRADE ATTENDED
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
11.							
12.							
13.							
14.							
15.							

_____
SIGNATURE

_____
TYPE: NAME & TITLE PHONE NO.